

REMARKS

This is a response to the Office Action dated December 1, 2005 in this application. As a preliminary matter, applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the allowance of claims 1-11 and 13-19. Claims 1-19 are pending in the present application. Individual issues raised in the Office Action are addressed next.

Specification

The Abstract was objected to as being in the improper form. A substitute Abstract has been provided. The substitute Abstract is believed to be in the proper form. Accordingly, withdrawal of the above objection is respectfully requested.

In the listing of claims, the status identifier of claim 4 was required to be corrected by changing from "withdrawn" to "original." This change has been made and the listing of claims now identifies the status of claim 4 as "original."

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,240,748 to Henderson et al. (the Henderson patent). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 12 recites:

A method for controlling a spin imparted on an optical fiber comprising the steps of:

imparting circumferential spin on a high-temperature optical fiber drawn from a preform;

obtaining dispersion pattern data peculiar to the spun optical fiber from scattered light naturally generated from the spin imparted on the optical fiber; and

controlling rate and period of the spin imparted on the optical fiber on the basis of the obtained dispersion pattern data.

(Emphasis added.)

In general, the Henderson patent discloses spin functions for spinning a fiber during manufacture in order to reduce PMD, in particular disclosing as advantageous certain nonsinusoidal spin functions. The portions of Henderson cited by the Examiner disclose, respectively: col. 1, lines 46-48: birefringence causes the polarization state of light propagating in the fiber to evolve periodically along the length of the fiber; col. 2, lines 21-

28: disadvantages of high spin rates; col. 3, lines 49-53: maximum spin rates of less than 10 turns/meter; col. 4, lines 58-63: a method for reducing PMD by spinning a fiber during the drawing process.

Nowhere does Henderson teach or suggest “obtaining dispersion pattern data peculiar to the spun optical fiber from scattered light naturally generated from the spin imparted on the optical fiber” or “controlling rate and period of the spin imparted on the optical fiber on the basis of the obtained dispersion pattern data.”

As Henderson fails to disclose each and every element of claim 12, it does not anticipate claim 12. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 12 should be withdrawn.

Allowable Subject Matter

In the instant Office Action, the Examiner states that claims 1-11 and 13-19 are allowed. The applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for this finding and further states that, in view of the above, claim 12 should be allowed as well.

Conclusion

In view of the above, applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. A favorable disposition to that effect is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any questions or comments concerning this submission, she is invited to call the undersigned at the phone number listed below.

Date: April 3, 2006

Respectfully submitted,



For Brian M. Rothery (Reg. No. 35,340)

By Lawrence R. Gabuzda (Reg. No. 51,711)

JONES DAY

222 East 41st Street

New York, New York 10017

(212) 326-3939